DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 204 FL 016 519

TITLE The New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual/ESL Fifth- through Eighth-Grade Teachers and Supervisors, 1985-1986. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 31p.; For related evaluative reports, see ED 270 546 and ED 270 550.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Teachers; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Ethnic Groups; Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Development; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Language Teachers; Limited English Speaking; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; *Staff Development; Supervisors; Urban Schools; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual/English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) Teachers and School Building Supervisors was designed to provide public school personnel working with limited English proficient children in grades five through eight with an overview of issues pertinent to the instruction of this population. The program served 453 teachers and 50 administrators from 32 school districts in a series of 6 half-day training sessions. Evaluation of the 1985-86 program was accomplished through teacher questionnaires, workshop evaluation forms, interviews, and on-site observations of training activities. It found that the program was successful in achieving most of its objectives. In the opinions of both the participants and the evaluation team, the program's major strengths were its overall organization and administration of training, presenters' enthusiasm and preparedness, links established between theory and practice, materials provided in workshops, and realistic demonstrations of instructional strategies. The major criticism was of the workshops' brevity. Recommendations for improvement include follow-up conferences for specific content areas and implementation, increased workshop time for presenter-participant interaction, inclusion of materials and presenters for those serving the Haitian population, and elimination of a proposed participant achievement objective, for practical reasons. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Guttenberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE NEW YORK CITY
STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
FOR BILINGUAL/E.S.L.
FIFTH- THROUGH EIGHTH-GRADE
TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS
1985-1986

OEA Evaluation Report

O.E.A. Evaluation Section Report

Robert Tobias, Administrator of Evaluation
Judith S. Torres, Senior Manager

Project Number: 42-68402

THE NEW YORK CITY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR BILINGUAL/E.S.L. FIFTH- THROUGH EIGHTH-GRADE TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS 1985-1986

Program Co-coordinators:
Angela Bazley
Mildred Gonzalez

Prepared by the
Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit
Armando Cotayo, Evaluation Manager
Jose J. Villegas, Evaluation/Planning Specialist
Shelley M. Fischer, Evaluation/Planning Specialist
Margaret H. Scorza, Editorial/Production Coordinator
Barbara Sjostrom, Evaluation Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

The New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual/E.S.L. Teachers and School Building Supervisors, funded by the Bureau of Bilingual Education of the New York State Education Department was designed to serve New York City public school personnel working with children of limited English proficiency (LEP) in grades five through eight.

The major objective of the program was to provide an overview of issues pertinent to the instruction of LEP students at these grade levels. The main themes of the workshops were methods for teaching mastery learning, an E.S.L. approach to teaching reading, teaching critical thinking skills, management techniques, and the history and current policy for the implementation of bilingual education and E.S.L. in New York City.

The director of the Office of Bilingual Education supervised the program, and the two deputy directors of that office were responsible for coordination. Six supervisors, six consultants, and eight administrative staff members also worked on the program. Planning and implementation of activities were coordinated with the Division of Personnel and Office of Budget and Review.

The program served 453 teachers (of whom 328 filled out program evaluation forms) and 50 administrators from the 32 community school districts in New York City in a series of six half-day training sessions conducted on two Saturdays each in December, January, and February. Each session included a general meeting followed by approximately sixteen concurrent workshops that addressed different aspects of the day's main topic.

Of the participants, 128 (42 percent) were born in the United States, 89 (29 percent) were born in Puerto Rico, and the rest were primarily from Central and South America. They included 207 (71 percent) persons with master's (M.A.) degrees and 23 (8 percent) with degrees beyond an M.A. Only 60 (21 percent) had not yet completed an M.A. degree. Of those with a baccalaureate (B.A.) degree, most had majored or minored in elementary education, content areas, or Spanish. Those who had earned graduate degrees generally specialized in bilingual education, elementary education, or English as a second language.

The majority of the participants were licensed or certified in Common Branches or Bilingual Common Branches. They had taught in grades five through eight for an average of six years; 56 percent were currently assigned as bilingual teachers, and 17 percent were currently assigned as E.S.L. teachers.

The evaluation for 1985-86 described the planning and implementation of the training sessions and assessed the program's effectiveness in accomplishing its objectives as proposed to and approved by the Bureau of Bilingual Education of the State Education Department. Data were collected through teacher-background questionnaires, evaluation forms, interviews, and on-site observations of training activities. An evaluation of the data indicated that the program was successful in achieving most of its objectives.

The program consisted of six semimonthly half-day sessions between December and February. Over 95 percent (341) of the participants attended the first December session, and 64 percent (228) attended the second session. In January, 81 percent (287) attended the first session, and 62 percent (221) attended the second session. The first February session had 72 percent (255) attendance, and the second session had 51 percent (183) attendance.

The participants rated the workshops on clarity, organization, scope, knowledge, thoroughness, and usefulness. Using a five-point scale, 98 to 100 percent of the participants rated all workshops greater than 4.3 along each dimension, indicating a high degree of satisfaction.

Participants who attended college in the U.S. and earned many credits in Spanish tended to report higher levels of satisfaction compared with those who earned many credits in English. Also, those who reported higher proficiency ratings in Spanish tended to report higher satisfaction ratings. Those who rated themselves as highly proficient in English were less satisfied. Finally, participants who had a master's degree, or more, tended to be less satisfied than participants with only a B.A.

In the opinion of both the participants and the evaluation team, the program's major strengths were the overall organization and administration of training; the presenters' enthusiasm, knowledge, and well-preparedness; the links established between theories presented in general sessions and classroom techniques taught in workshops; the appropriateness and abundance of materials provided in the workshops; and the realistic demonstrations of instructional strategies. The participants' major criticism was that the workshop sessions were not long enough to permit effective interaction with the presenters.

The following recommendations are aimed at improving staff development programs in the future:

1. Follow-up training conferences might be planned and implemented for specific content areas (e.g., science, social studies) especially for personnel working with LEP students at the junior high school level. Building upon this year's program, such conferences would provide an opportunity for in-depth training in teaching content areas to LEP students.

2. The Office of Bilingual Education might consider changing the staff development training session format to provide more time for workshop presentations and for interaction between workshop presenters and participants. The evaluation team recommends a 45-minute general session followed by concurrent workshops of 90 to 105 minutes.

3. The Office of Bilingual Education might identify materials and presenters for the Haitian component of the training workshops in the future. Neither materials nor hand-outs were used in the two workshops that were observed for this language group. Although

the team recognizes the difficulty in obtaining materials for this language group, it is imperative that they receive training in curricular matters beyond the scope of language issues.

4. One of the training sessions might be devoted to a one-day follow-up in the fall to assess the extent to which teaching strategies taught at the conference are being implemented in the classroom.

5. In the future, staff development training for teachers and administrators might take place separately to allow for a greater focus on the particular roles and needs of each group.

6. The project should eliminate the proposed participant achievement objective because developing a criterion-referenced instrument to assess how much participants learned from the workshops may not be practical.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The production of this report, as of all Office of Educational Assessment/Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit reports, is the result of a cooperative effort of regular staff and consultants. In addition to those whose names appear on the cover, Eulalia Cabrera has interpreted findings and has integrated material into reports. Arthur Lopatin has edited the reports following the O.E.A. style guide and has written report summaries. Finally, Joseph Rivera, Marcia Gilbert, and Bruce Roach have worked intensively as word processors to produce and correct reports. Without their able and faithful participation, the unit could not have handled such a large volume of work and still produced quality evaluation reports.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	OVERVIEW	1
II.	PARTICIPANTS' CHARACTERISTICS	6
III.	FINDINGS	10
	Attendance	10
	Satisfaction	11
	Achievement	15
IV.	RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FINDINGS AND PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS	16
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
Table 1:	Participants' Educational Backgrounds: Areas of Concentration.	6
Table 2:	Number and Percent of Program Participants by Country of Birth.	8
Table 3:	Average Satisfaction Ratings for Each Dimension, by Session.	12

NEW YORK CITY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR BILINGUAL/E.S.L.
FIFTH- THROUGH EIGHTH-GRADE TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS

PROGRAM LOCATION:	Office of Bilingual Education 131 Livingston Street Brooklyn, New York 11201
YEAR OF OPERATION:	1985-1986
TARGET POPULATION:	453 bilingual/E.S.L. teachers and supervisors (grades five through eight)
PROGRAM DIRECTOR:	Angela Bazley

I. OVERVIEW

The New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual/E.S.L. Teachers and School Building Supervisors, grades five through eight, is the third in a series of staff development conferences offered by the Office of Bilingual Education (O.B.E.) of the New York City Board of Education for personnel who are serving limited English proficient (LEP) students throughout the city. This project, funded by the Bureau of Bilingual Education of the New York State Education Department (N.Y.S.E.D.), was designed to provide training specifically for those serving students in grades five through eight.

According to a needs assessment conducted by O.B.E. last year, approximately 13,000 fifth- through eighth-grade students were enrolled in bilingual education programs in New York City during the 1985-86 school year. These students comprise 24 percent of the total number of LEP students enrolled in bilingual/English as a second language (E.S.L.) programs. Because such a large number of students was involved, and no program had previously provided in-service staff training, the Staff Development Project was instituted to offer wide-reaching in-service

training for teachers and administrators serving these students. Fifty school building supervisors and 453 teachers were selected to participate in the program, with priority given to licensed bilingual/E.S.L. teachers and administrators.

The program did not stipulate a maximum of four years' teaching experience for selection, as had been the case with staff development programs designed for teachers of lower grade levels. This decision was made because this program covered seventh- and eighth-grade teachers, who have specialized backgrounds in many different content areas. It was desirable for the training program to reach as wide a range of personnel as possible; therefore, the coordinators decided to lessen the eligibility requirements. Although O.B.E. staff recognized that a more heterogeneous group would make it more difficult to meet all the participants' needs, the extra effort was deemed worthwhile in relation to the benefits.

The 1985-86 program was developed based on the model of the training conferences held previously. O.B.E.'s extensive expertise in bilingual/E.S.L. education and in conducting in-service training facilitated both planning and implementation. Training consisted of six half-day workshops between December 1985 and February 1986. The topics addressed were: methods for teaching mastery learning, teaching reading with an E.S.L. approach, teaching critical thinking, interaction strategies, techniques of classroom management, and the history of and policy for the implementation of bilingual/E.S.L. education in New York City.

According to the project director, the initial impetus for the development of in-service training for personnel working with LEP students resulted from visits to several school districts made by the director of

O.B.E. The director perceived the need for training and decided to pursue funding for training projects. O.B.E. subsequently applied for and received funding from the N.Y.S.E.D.'s Bureau of Bilingual Education for staff development.

The director of O.B.E. oversaw the program, while O.B.E.'s deputy directors were responsible for direction and coordination. The latter hired consultants to make presentations, recruited and selected participants, determined the content and format for the sessions, and arranged for the processing of the necessary paperwork. Topics for discussion were selected in consultation with personnel from the N.Y.S.E.D. and the New York City Board of Education.

Information about the program was distributed to all 32 New York City community school districts through circulars, letters, and application forms containing details on pre-registration procedures, and the dates, times, and topics of the sessions. Applications required the approval and signatures of principals and district superintendents. The school districts nominated some 600 people, from whom O.B.E. selected 453 teachers and 50 administrators. Priority was given to those with bilingual/E.S.L. licenses.

The 1985-86 program took place during six Saturday morning sessions (8:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.) on December 7 and 14, January 11 and 25, and February 1 and 22. The six sessions had a similar format: registration, opening remarks, a one-hour general meeting, and a form-filling session, after which the group separated to attend 90-minute workshops. (An average of 16 people took part in each workshop.)

Field practitioners representing various language groups and subject areas conducted the workshops, which were designed to expand upon and apply information that had been presented during the general meetings.

The following topics were covered at the general meeting and the workshop sessions: the history of and legislation on language programs in New York State, teaching language arts and reading, using content areas to teach critical thinking skills, classroom management techniques, interaction strategies, E.S.L. methodology, and mastery learning techniques. Each of the six general sessions presented a theoretical overview of one of these topics. The 16 workshops focused on the practical applications of concepts that were presented during the general sessions.

Keynote speakers at the general sessions included the director of the New York Bilingual Education Multifunctional Service Center, the director of the Bilingual Teacher Training Program at Teachers College, Columbia University, a bilingual education professor from Hunter College (CUNY), an E.S.L. education professor from New York University, the chairman of the Education Committee of the New York State Assembly, and a consultant in education.

Prior to the workshops, meetings were held with workshop leaders to determine their grade-level experience, areas of special expertise, and other basic information, as well as to discuss the program's basic goals. In addition, the format and content of the six general sessions were discussed to ensure the link between the theoretical questions discussed in the general sessions and the practical issues addressed in the workshops. Handouts were prepared by the O.B.E. based on the content of the general sessions. (These included a recommended list of readings.) The handouts

were distributed at the sessions and were used to follow the presentations.

This evaluation report examines the extent to which the program met its objectives as outlined in the funding proposal to N.Y.S.E.D. It is based on data collected as follows:

-- a teacher background questionnaire completed by 328 participants;

-- evaluation forms, developed by the Office of Educational Assessment, to determine participant satisfaction with program activities;

-- observation of the six general sessions and the sixteen workshops;

-- formal interviews with the program director and assistant director on the planning, implementation, and effectiveness of the program, and on plans for the future; and

-- informal interviews with participants.

This evaluation report examines the extent to which the program met its objectives as outlined in the funding proposal to N.Y.S.E.D. It is based on data collected as follows:

-- a teacher background questionnaire completed by 328 participants;

-- evaluation forms, developed by the Office of Educational Assessment, to determine participant satisfaction with program activities;

-- observation of the six general sessions and the sixteen workshops;

-- formal interviews with the program director and assistant director on the planning, implementation, and effectiveness of the program, and on plans for the future; and

-- informal interviews with participants.

II. PARTICIPANTS' CHARACTERISTICS

Program participants came from all of New York City's community school districts (C.S.D.s). Of the 328 participants who completed the background questionnaire, 25 were from C.S.D. 19; 23 from C.S.D. 6; 22 from C.D.S. 4; and 20 from C.S.D. 32. The other districts each had fewer than 20 participants.

Educationally, 207 (71 percent) of the participants had at least a master's degree, and 23 (8 percent) had more advanced levels of education. Only 60 (21 percent) did not have a master's degree. The participants' undergraduate majors and minors are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Participants' Educational Backgrounds:
Areas of Concentration

	MAJOR		MINOR	
AREA	N	(%)	N	(%)
Elementary Education	87	27	84	26
Content Areas	62	19	58	18
Spanish	60	18	33	10
Guidance/Counseling	20	6	15	5
Bilingual Education	19	6	11	3
All Other Areas	73	22	68	20

The participants were similarly diverse with respect to their national origin, the specialization of those who had gone beyond the B.A. level, and their teaching experience. One hundred twenty-eight teachers (42 percent) were born in the United States and 89 (29 percent) were born in Puerto Rico. Of the remaining participants, the majority were born in Spanish-speaking countries of Central and South America. Table 2 shows the participants' countries of birth and the number and percent of participants from each country.

The specializations of the 230 (79 percent) program participants who had more than a B.A. were as follows: bilingual education, 100 (43 percent); elementary education, 57 (25 percent); E.S.L., 42 (18 percent); and content areas, 35 (15 percent). Most participants, regardless of degree, were licensed or certified in the following two areas: Common Branches, 111 (34 percent) and Bilingual Common Branches, 162 (49 percent).

Of the 188 participants who reported their number of years of intermediate-grade teaching experience, 91 (48 percent) had four or fewer years of experience; and 97 (52 percent) had experience ranging from five to 20 years.

Of the participants who reported their assignments, 185 (56 percent) were assigned as bilingual teachers and 55 (17 percent) were E.S.L. teachers; they had been working with grades five through eight for an average of six years. Seventy-six teachers (23 percent) had experience as both E.S.L. and bilingual teachers for grades five through eight. Of the bilingual teachers, 106 (32 percent) reported having experience teaching these grades. All of those who reported to be bilingual teachers taught in English and Spanish.

TABLE 2

Number and Percent of Program Participants
by Country of Birth

Country of Birth	Number	Percent
U.S.A.	128	42
Puerto Rico	89	29
Cuba	17	6
Haiti	12	4
Dominican Republic	9	3
Ecuador	9	3
Spain	9	3
Panama	8	3
Peru	3	1
Colombia	3	1
China	2	1
Costa Rica	1	*
El Salvador	1	*
Argentina	1	*
Italy	1	*
Poland	1	*
England	1	*
Other European	1	*
Israel	1	*
Other Middle Eastern	1	*
Thailand	1	*
U.S.S.R.	1	*
Canada	1	*

* Less than one percent

- Most participants were born in the United States and Puerto Rico.

Data regarding the current status/position of those participating in the program were available for 315 teachers. At the time of the program, 166 (53 percent) were tenured, 46 (15 percent) were regular substitutes, 44 (14 percent) were probationary, and 58 (18 percent) were per diem substitutes.

Finally, 77 teachers (23 percent) reported that they had formerly been educational assistants. Of these, 36 reported having five or more years of experience as educational assistants.

III. FINDINGS

The program implemented all of its proposed activities on schedule, and there were no major modifications of either the content or the format of the six general sessions. Although a few minor changes had to be made in the order of topics, no changes were necessary in either the speakers or the topics covered. The most difficult problem, which was identified by the program director and corroborated by the evaluators, was to allot sufficient time for the workshops. It was also difficult to make sure that all of the workshop leaders were prepared and available as needed. Finally, processing per diem stipends for all participants and obtaining completed questionnaires and evaluation forms required meticulous management by the O.B.E. staff.

In the following section findings are presented by program objectives, as outlined in the proposal to N.Y.S.E.D.

ATTENDANCE

-- Eighty percent of the bilingual/E.S.L. supervisors and fifth through eighth grade teachers registered in the program will attend each of the six sessions proposed.

The training program consisted of six half-day sessions. Each session offered two types of presentations: one general presentation from 9:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.; and 16 specific workshops from 10:45 a.m. to 11:45 a.m., of which participants selected one.

According to the attendance records maintained by O.B.E., 96 percent (341) of those registered for the program attended the first December session, and 64 percent (228) attended the second December session; 81 percent (287) attended the first January session, and 62 percent (211)

attended the second session; 72 percent (255) attended the first February session and 51 percent (183) attended the second session. Thus the program objective of an 80 percent attendance rate was met on only two of the six sessions. It should be pointed out that it was snowing heavily on the day of one of the February sessions.

SATISFACTION

-- Ninety percent of the participants will be highly satisfied (an average rating of three or above on a five-point Likert scale) with the clarity, organization, scope, presenters' knowledge, thoroughness, and value of the training sessions.

The questionnaire given to participants asked them to rate the clarity, organization, scope, thoroughness, and usefulness of the presentations, and to provide an assessment of the presenters' knowledge on a five-point Likert Scale (1=lowest; 5=highest). The mean combined rating for each dimension for all general and workshop presentations was an average of 4.5 or higher, indicating that virtually all participants were highly pleased with the program (see Table 3). Thus, the proposed objective was met.

Table 3 also presents mean satisfaction ratings for each day. Overall, satisfaction ratings were very high, ranging from 4.2 to 4.9. The degree of agreement among participants and the consistency of high satisfaction ratings across dimensions suggest that the participants were highly satisfied with the Staff Development Program.

Overall, participants were extremely satisfied with both the general presentations and the workshops. In fact, most workshops received a mean rating of 4.5 or higher on all dimensions.

TABLE 3

Average Satisfaction Ratings* For Each Dimension, By Session

	DIMENSION					
Session	Clarity	Organiza-tion	Scope	Knowledge	Thorough-ness	Use-fulness
Day 1	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.4
Day 2	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7
Day 3	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.6
Day 4**	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.6	4.6
Day 5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.2
Day 6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.3
Overall	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.5

* Range = 1 to 5; 1 = lowest, 5 = highest.
** Data are available only for the general presentation.

- Overall, the participant satisfaction objective was achieved when data were analyzed by session.

The evaluation team observed four of the six general sessions. Three of the four keynote speakers were to-the-point, well-organized, and sensitive to the needs of their audience. Accordingly, their presentations were well received. In addition, despite the large number of people involved, they allowed sufficient time for questions. By contrast, there were difficulties with the fourth speaker's presentation, in which the speaker made comparisons between the empathy of bilingual/E.S.L. and mainstream teachers for their students. This led several participants to protest what they felt was an inappropriate attitude in a program that was supposed to bring together the different kinds of people serving LEP students. However the speaker dealt with these protests fairly well during the question-and-answer period.

The evaluation team also observed 15 workshops: two on the Lau and Aspira Consent Decrees and on mastery learning techniques for supervisors; four for bilingual teachers (two Spanish/English and two Haitian Creole); three on developing thinking skills; and six on E.S.L. teaching methods. An important feature of most workshops was the successful incorporation of themes presented in the general sessions.

Numerous hand-outs and materials were used in 13 of the 15 sessions that were observed. Examples include a principal's guide for identifying, testing, and placing LEP children; brain-teasers; New York City E.S.L. curricula; bubble-makers; Bloom's taxonomy using real-world examples; puzzles; instructions for making puppets; and lesson plan outlines.

Program participants were asked to list what they perceived to be the "primary strengths" of the general meetings and the workshops. Their answers on evaluation forms as well as in informal interviews revealed

three main strengths: (1) materials, such as hand-outs and visuals, and their demonstrations; (2) presenters' skills, especially in clarity of expression, empathy with teachers, and teaching strategies; and (3) the conference itself, as a forum for sharing ideas with peers. Other strengths that were identified included exposure to E.S.L. curricula, overviews provided in general sessions, publishers' exhibits, and overall organization of the training sessions.

Participants were also asked to make "recommendations for future activities." The overwhelming majority of respondents recommended that this program be continued. Many favored reducing the amount of time devoted to general sessions and increasing the amount of time for workshops. Many participants also suggested that more time be alloted for discussion and interaction between the workshop presenters and the program participants. Several people felt a lack of time had left workshop presenters hard-pressed to include all the necessary information in their sessions. They noted that the time shortage in workshop sessions was aggravated when, as sometimes was the case, the general sessions ran overtime.

Participants had few other recommendations for improvement. The majority said they would be willing to attend future workshops even without monetary compensation because they found these sessions to be informative, well-organized, and extremely helpful to their work with LEP students.

In summary, based on the evaluation team's observations, analyses of participants' evaluation forms, and informal interviews, this staff development project was highly successful in achieving its participant-satisfaction goals.

ACHIEVEMENT

-- As a result of this training program, participants will demonstrate a statistically significant ($p<.05$) increase in knowledge of methodology for teaching E.S.L. and reading mastery learning, critical thinking skills, classroom management techniques, and Bilingual/E.S.L. policy in New York State.

This proposed objective was based on the assumption that criterion-referenced tests would be administered on a pretest and posttest basis to measure participants' achievement. Since a relevant criterion-referenced test was unavailable, and since the N.Y.S.E.D. agreed that alternate measures of achievement lacked validity, this objective could not be evaluated.

IV. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FINDINGS AND PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

SATISFACTION RATINGS AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

An additional evaluation goal was to determine if participants' satisfaction ratings were related to their various backgrounds. Correlations were computed to assess the relationship between each satisfaction dimension and the following background variables: highest degree earned, area of specialization, number of graduate education credits earned; age, proficiency ratings in English and Spanish, type of license/certification, years of teaching experience, teaching assignment (e.g., E.S.L., bilingual), current position, language background, and place of education. On the whole, it was found that participants' backgrounds were not strongly related to their satisfaction ratings. Of all the variables, the only relationships that were found to be statistically significant were highest degree earned, the number of college credits earned in the U.S. in English and Spanish, and proficiency ratings in English and Spanish.

To perform the analysis, participants with a bachelor's degree (60) and those with at least a master's degree (230) were grouped separately. The results indicated a small but statistically significant negative correlation between the teachers' satisfaction with the scope ($r = -.09$) and usefulness ($r = -.14$) of the presentation, suggesting that participants with a post-B.A. education (i.e., master's degree and beyond) were somewhat less satisfied with the scope and value of the workshops than those who held only a bachelor's degree.

However, since the correlation was small and many more participants had master's degrees than had bachelor's degrees, caution must be exercised in assigning too much weight to this relationship.

The other characteristic that was related to participant satisfaction was the number of college credits earned in the U.S. in English and in Spanish. Participants who had earned a great number of credits in English when they attended college in the U.S. tended to rate the information presented at the sessions as more thorough ($r = .15$) and more useful ($r = .11$) than those who had earned fewer credits in English. Those who earned a great number of credits in Spanish appeared to be the most satisfied: they rated the purpose of the workshops to be quite clear ($r = .17$); the presentations to be well-organized ($r = .13$); the scope of the presentations to be adequate ($r = .18$); the presenters to be thorough ($r = .15$); and the sessions to be useful ($r = .16$).

Although these correlations are weak, the same satisfaction variables were found to be significant for proficiency ratings in English and Spanish.

In general, those who rated themselves as highly proficient in English tended to be less satisfied with the presentations than those who rated themselves highly proficient in Spanish. Specifically, as self-ratings in English proficiency increased, ratings on the presentations' thoroughness ($r = .10$) and usefulness ($r = -.18$) decreased. Conversely, as self-ratings in Spanish proficiency increased, ratings of the presentation's clarity ($r = .13$), organization ($r = .14$), scope (.19), and usefulness ($r = .24$) increased. Also, these participants rated the presenters as highly knowledgeable ($r = .10$) and thorough ($r = .18$).

Overall, not all satisfaction dimensions were significantly correlated with proficiency ratings, and those correlations that were statistically significant were not strong. However, there was little variability among ratings because 1) most participants agreed that the presenters and the presentations were very good, and 2) proficiency ratings did not vary much either. This lack of variability is likely to limit the potential magnitude of the observed correlations. In sum, although approval ratings were high, there does appear to be some meaningful relationship between the number of college credits earned in English and Spanish, how the teachers evaluated themselves on language proficiency, and how they evaluated the workshops.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In its third of a series of citywide training sessions, the New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual/E.S.L. Fifth- through Eighth-Grade Teachers was successful. In all six sessions, the organizational skills of the program's staff were evident in such matters as registration procedure, involving hundreds of participants, and the smooth transitions between activities. The schedule of activities was followed as proposed, with no major modifications.

The speakers, workshop leaders, and participants were highly motivated and participated actively in all activities. Interaction between staff members and participants was positive and ideas were freely exchanged throughout the program. The content and structure of the general sessions and their related workshops were consistent with the program's objectives, and they were well received by participants.

When participants were asked to make recommendations for future programs, many suggested that more time should be alloted for the workshops. They suggested that the time allotted for the general sessions should be reduced to accomplish this goal. The evaluation team agreed with this recommendation, since most presenters appeared hard-pressed to finish their workshops. (The program director stated that the total time allotted for each conference session had to be limited to three and one-half hours because the budget was limited and the option of eliminating half the applicants in order to offer full-day sessions had been rejected.)

In general, respondents believed that handouts, visual aids, and other materials used during the workshops had strengthened the presentations. They considered most speakers to be skillful in making clear, well-organized,

and interesting presentations. Several respondents also indicated that it had been helpful to have presenters who were or had been experienced intermediate grade-level bilingual/E.S.L. teachers.

Most of the respondents said that the information presented in the general meetings was helpful, and had served as a good introduction to workshop sessions. The few negative comments that were made concerned lack of time for questions and answers and for demonstrating materials. The observations of the evaluation team support the participants' opinions concerning the content, usefulness of information, and the need to devote more time to workshops.

In summary, interviews, questionnaires, and observations indicate that participants were highly satisfied with both the general presentations and the workshops that were offered in the 1985-86 staff development training program. Participants' satisfaction ratings were somewhat related to the number of college credits earned in Spanish and English while attending college in the U.S., and to self-ratings of English and Spanish proficiency. To a lesser extent, educational background may also have contributed to participants' assessment of the program. Overall, since most background variables explored were not statistically significant, it is safest to conclude that the participants were highly satisfied with the program largely because of the high quality of the workshops offered. In fact, the majority stated they would attend future workshops on similar topics even without monetary compensation.

On the basis of its analysis of the program, the evaluation team offers the following recommendations for the planning of similar programs in the future:

1. Follow-up training conferences might be planned and implemented on specific content areas (e.g., science, social studies), especially at the junior high school level, for personnel working with LEP students. Building upon this year's program, such conferences would provide an opportunity for in-depth training in teaching content areas to LEP students.

2. The Office of Bilingual Education might consider changing the staff development training session format to allow more time for workshop presentations and for interaction between workshop presenters and participants. The evaluation team recommends a 45 minute general session followed by concurrent workshops of 90 to 105 minutes.

3. The Office of Bilingual Education might identify materials and presenters for the Haitian component of the training workshops. Neither materials nor hand-outs were used in the two workshops that were observed for this language group. Although the team recognizes the difficulty in obtaining materials for this language group, it is imperative that they receive training in curricular matters beyond the scope of language issues.

4. One of the training sessions might be devoted to a one-day follow-up in the fall to assess the extent to which teaching strategies taught at the conference are being implemented in the classroom.

5. In the future, staff development training for teachers and administrators might take place separately to allow for a greater focus on the particular roles and needs of each group.

6. The project should eliminate the proposed participant achievement objective because developing a criterion-referenced instrument to assess how much participants learned from the workshops may not be practical.